

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VIII

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 21, 1914

No. 7

In the Educational Supplement Section of The Nation for May 7, 1914, under the caption, One of the Giants, there is a vigorous attack on the part that the study of philology has, in recent decades, played in the preparation of the teacher of English composition and literature. Such teachers, the writer took for granted, must be doctors of philosophy. The training of such doctors and prospective teachers, involving a "streng wissenschaftliche drill in Germanic philology", such as a study of the scanty remains of Gothic literature, and a consequent "minimizing <of> the classical and renaissance element in our literature", the writer denounces as a "vicious system".

All this, however, is far less interesting and important than the paragraph in which the writer urges an alliance of lovers of English literature and lovers of the Classics.

At a public meeting of the Modern Language Association, held in this city in December of 1910, the late E. M. Shepard, eminent as a legal scholar and statesman, called upon the teachers there assembled "to uphold the lofty standard embodied in a study of the humanities, to make the cause of the classics one with that of modern literatures, and to lead young men to see in life more than that which will lead to the accumulation of wealth in an age absorbed in the pursuit of riches". How much has the English department of . . . any . . . of our great universities done to forward this noble ideal? The pressing need of English instruction is to make its cause one with the classics, not only for the sake of the languishing classics, but quite as much for its own sake. Such a union would be profoundly fructifying and would at the same time put an end to a vast deal of rubbish. What has the English department done to help this union? The instructors will say that they are heartily in favor of such a programme, but what have they done? Are they ready to give up a single one of their remaining requirements in philology and mediaevalism so as to allow the English student time to do a small amount of work in the classics? No; when it comes to the test they will tell you that after all it is not right that the future teacher of English should leave the university without being grounded in the sources of his language—by which they mean Uphilas and the other Giant grinning at the gate.

The suggestion of an alliance between teachers of English and lovers of the Classics has in fact been made more than once lately by teachers of English, e. g. by Professor Lane Cooper, of the English Department of Cornell University, in the fine paper read by him in April last at the meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. It would seem that such a suggestion need only be stated to win enthusiastic support

from both parties to the proposed alliance. How anyone can read or teach English literature without a first-hand knowledge of the Greek and Latin literatures is to me incomprehensible; how anyone can be devoted to English literature without being devoted also to the most important sources of English literature, the Greek and Latin literatures, assuming that he knows them, is equally incomprehensible.

Recently an extremely skilful and successful teacher of undergraduate English in a great University expressed himself to me in very vigorous terms in condemnation of undergraduate courses in English literature as consisting almost entirely of belles-lettres; such courses, he continued, include no serious reading in the fields of history or philosophy. Naturally such easy courses in one's own vernacular are more popular with many students than courses in Latin and Greek, whose extant remains belong, almost without exception, within the very fields which current courses in English literature avoid.

The same point is made in an article entitled English as Humane Letters, by Professor Frank Aydelotte, of the Department of English in the University of Indiana, published in The Atlantic Monthly for September last (pages 377-380).

Much of our greatest English literature is read by the American undergraduate, if at all, not in the English department, but in the department of philosophy or sociology or history or theology or the fine arts. We have gradually narrowed the content of our literary courses until we have little left except descriptions of nature, love stories, and lyrics. The habit of using books filled with brief selections from a large number of authors prevents the student from getting any clear and complete notion of what any English man of letters was really trying to say (379).

In another part of his paper (378) Professor Aydelotte makes a reply, in effect, to the criticism cited above from The Nation (though he does not mention that article):

The popularity of the study of English, however, need not blind us to the very unsatisfactory nature of its results. Whatever good things it may do for our undergraduates it does not teach them to think, does not offer them any severe intellectual discipline; it is not a good course for a man to take who wants to develop that power of sane, keen thinking which is the distinguishing mark of a liberal education.

This fact is even more apparent in the case of the students who give their attention mainly to *belles-lettres*, to the appreciation of literature, than in those

who confine themselves to philology and literary history. The popular outcry against linguistics and source-hunting does not go to the root of the matter. Among English professors and English students alike are many able men who have sought in philology and in the history of literature something solid, something of real intellectual value, something 'to bite on', which they could not find in courses in literary 'appreciation'. And for that point of view there is this justification, that most of the graduates from our literary courses who are comparatively free from philology, and are not at all absorbed in the *minutiae* of literary history, are lamentably deficient in power of thought, in the ability to understand literature—woefully lacking in real literary interests. Literary power is power to think and power to feel in the sense in which feeling becomes illumination and yields a result similar to the result of thought. This illumination our training in English literature seems somehow not to give.

In the opening paragraphs of his paper (377) Professor Aydelotte warmly praises the classical course, especially as it has been worked out at Oxford: that education, he says,

has been obviously practical in its results. Oxford and Cambridge men have ruled brilliantly the greatest empire in the world, they have given England one of the most democratic governments and almost the cleanest politics on earth, they have played their part with credit in business and in every profession.

The student of the Classics at Oxford, he continues, studies not only the principal Greek and Latin poets, orators and dramatists, but the classic historians and philosophers—in a word, he deals not only with the aesthetic qualities of Greek and Latin literature but with Greek and Roman thought. The classical course thus offers to the undergraduate the key to modern civilization.

"Probably no training in modern literature", he says further, "can be made to equal this in intellectual value". He sees no chance of any very extensive study of the Classics in America. The one hope, then, of making the study of English literature a truly fruitful study is to pursue that study as the study of the Classics is pursued at Oxford. English writers must be treated not merely as "elegant amusement for our idle hours"; we must regard the poets and novelists and essayists as those who are "trying to unify and explain life to us, and to give us the zest for it which their divine vision has brought to them". The value of a piece of literature lies in its author's thought about life.

Further into Professor Aydelotte's paper there is not space to go; the extracts given above will show that, though addressed primarily to teachers of English, it is full of suggestiveness also for the teacher of the Classics.

C. K.

NEW HISTORICAL MATERIAL IN THE REVISED STATE-DOCUMENTS OF ATHENS

In the century and a half between 403 and 230 B.C., enough decrees of the Attic state found lasting record in stone to preserve through the succeeding centuries to our own day the memory of more than 800 of them. Three-fourths of these had been in the hands of his-

torians and epigraphists before the recent collection of all the extant decrees appeared¹. This, however, has added in a breath some 200 new fragments. Such an accession of new historical material ought not to pass unnoticed. The following rapid summary may serve to draw attention to its value. So many of the new fragments supplement older pieces, that I have thought it advisable to give the historic setting of new documents through brief mention of the more important older ones. Consequently, this paper has become a cursory résumé of the state-business of Athens between the dates given, in the light of the latest additions to our knowledge. As a means of reference, I give in parentheses the numbers of the documents as they appear in the new volume.

Our summary begins at the time of the fall of Athens, in 403 B.C., with the well-known Samian decree (1), a document on which a generation of epigraphists has successfully labored, until, in its latest dress, it stands before us nearly complete; for it has been entirely restored with the exception of two proper names. Thus for seventy-five lines we can read of the loyal devotion of Athens and Samos to each other during those years of terror, 405-402 B.C., first after Aegospotami, when this island alone remained faithful to the imperial city, and two years later, when Athens befriended the Samian democrats in their exile and paid special honor to one of the Samian families.

Next (6), the restored Athenian democracy can be seen at work repairing the mischief done by the Thirty, incidentally, (10), repaying with citizenship those brave metics—farmers, cooks, carpenters, bakers and the like—who had helped to expel the Tyrants. The period of fresh aggression and the beginning of the Corinthian War are signalized by treaties of alliance with Boeotia (14), Locris (15), and Eretria (16). A new fragment (17) apparently refers to the famous naval engagement that took place off Cnidus during this war and to some deed of valor there by the Thasian army-seer, Sothrys. Familiar documents follow: treaties with King Seuthes of Thrace (21) and with Thasos (24), negotiations with Clazomenae (28), and other concrete evidences of the second attempts made by Athens at empire, attempts which were so rudely blocked by the King's Peace, in the winter of 386 B.C. Eloquent testimony to what this Peace meant in many of the Greek states can be found in the list of Thasian refugees for whom Athens is obliged to provide in the year following (33), as well as in a treaty with Chios (35), which is important as marking the real beginning of the second Athenian Confederacy.

Before the actual establishment of this new league, however, Athenian politics became embroiled with

¹See *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Vol. II, III, Editio Minor, Pars Prima, Fasciculus Prior, Edidit J. Kirchner, Berlin, 1913. This is the first of a series of volumes which will replace *Inscriptiones Graecae* II, Parts 1-5 and III, Parts 1-3. Of the original volumes, II contained the inscriptions dated between 403 B.C. and the reign of Augustus, III all later documents. This division of material has now been given up. Hence the revision bears the double numbering II, III.

Theban when the Spartans seized the Cadmeia and forced into exile Pelopidas and his party. Until mid-winter of 379-378 the exiles found refuge in Athens; then, by their famous stratagem of disguise, they regained control of Thebes. At some time during their residence, it is conjectured, Athens passed the decree (37) which, by the addition of a new fragment, contains a list of 32 names, mostly non-Attic and presumably Boeotian. Among these there is one which, according to Kirchner, begins with the letters Πρ[α]. There is a fascinating possibility, however, that what was actually carved on the stone was Πε[λωιδας]. But, even if there is no definite connection with that hero, the new list of names goes a long way towards proving the certain connection of this document with the Theban refugees.

At this same time Sparta was engaged in throttling the new and promising Olynthiac Confederacy. Athens naturally sympathized with the towns of Chalcidice. Something more substantial than mere expressions of good-will are indicated by the new fragment 'Αφυσίων (55), which looks suspiciously like the heading of a treaty of alliance with the Pallenian town, where in 380 the Spartan king Agesipolis died of a fever. A similar new heading Αα[ρυσια] (68), together with a new fragment (39), honoring certain citizens of Larissa may indicate the trend of Athenian diplomacy in this connection. If the land-route to the north, which this Thessalian town commanded, could be closed to Sparta, her operations in Chalcidice would be materially hampered. All efforts, however, were unavailing. The confederacy was forced to dissolve and the separate states were made Spartan allies.

Athens formally inaugurated her second league in the early spring of 377 B.C. The legislative document on which this was based is still preserved (43), and has for many years been among the most precious of our epigraphical treasures. The actual launching of the league was preceded by separate treaties with some of the more important states, such as Chios (35), Thebes (40), Mitylene (40), Methymna (42), and Byzantium (41). In a new fragment (76) one of the Byzantine ambassadors is singled out for special honors. We may assume that it was for efficient and friendly assistance in bringing the negotiations to a satisfactory conclusion. Treaties and alliances with other states, contracted during the next few years, are still preserved. An important addition supplementing the document which contains the preliminary negotiations with Corcyra, Acarnania, and Cephallenia (96) is part of the actual treaty with Cephallenia (98). Besides being a companion-piece to the treaty with Corcyra (97), it throws fresh light on the relations between Athens and her allies in this second league.

There is no new material for the period of Theban supremacy. But these years are already rich in documents that preserve the texts of treaties with the Macedonian King, Amyntas II (102), with Plato's

friend and pupil, the young Dionysius II (105), with the Arcadians, the Achaeans, the Eleans, and the Phliasians (112), once held to be the agreement immediately preceding the battle of Mantinea, but more recently, and by Kirchner, dated immediately after that event, and with the Thessalian coalition against Alexander, the villainous tyrant of Pherae (116); and those important decrees of the State, thanking the Mitylenaeans for help in war (107), and reorganizing the affairs of Iulis in Ceos (111). Several relate to that brilliant repulse of Theban aggrandizement in Euboea during the spring of 357 B.C. which called forth the oratory of Timotheus and the voluntary liturgy of Demosthenes. Additional information on these events may ultimately be gleaned from a new fragment (147), which, although much mutilated and dateable only through the shapes of the letters, seems to be part of a treaty with Chalcis at this time.

And now the trouble with Philip begins. The documents that bear upon the tangled politics of this period are especially valuable to us as they increase our independence of Demosthenes and Aeschines. The unimpassioned records of the state help us to determine what actually did occur and how much the orators perverted the facts in the face of a willingly forgetful jury. We have two new honorary decrees of this period, one (181) naming a certain Posidanius, the other (182) a certain Apollodorus, neither of whom has hitherto been known to history. The second was passed on the motion of a Philocrates, probably the citizen who distinguished himself later in connection with the famous Peace that bears his name. A new bit has been added from Professor Wilhelm's papers to the decree of citizenship bestowed upon the Mysian satrap Orontes (207). The new piece is of immediate importance as it adds a fourth strategus, Proxenus, to the three already known to have held office in 349-348 B.C., Chares, Charidemus, and Phocion. This Proxenus, famed as a descendant of Harmodius, the Tyrannicide, held the same office three years later, in 346, according to Aeschines and Demosthenes. But restoration of the document has barely begun. The fragments suggest some otherwise unknown agreements with the satrap, making mention of Lesbos, money and boats. There are tempting opportunities here for the restorer; the importance of understanding a decree of this nature contemporary with the fall of Olynthus can not be overestimated by a student of Demosthenes. Among the documents that can be connected with the Olynthiac War is one (211) which clearly testifies to the marvelous powers of Wilhelm. Beginning with nothing but a column from two to ten letters wide and thirteen lines long, he has built up a decree, granting immunity from the normal metic-tax to Olynthian refugees, that is fifteen lines long and twenty-eight letters wide. Not only are these daring conjectures accepted as practically certain but also his suggestion that the mover was Demosthenes himself is felt to be historically most plausible.

The renewed treaty with Mitylene (213) and the great record of honors from the Athenian state to the Bosporean kings still stand as practically the sole representatives of the Peace-Year, 346. A new document (218), however, of the next year looks back to the time of the Peace and adds some poignant details to the story of Philip's unfair and under-hand activities in Thrace. It is the old story of asylum to political refugees. This time it is Abdera whose citizens are accorded temporary residence 'until such time as they can be restored' and the Macedonian party ousted. How optimistically did Attic statesmen look to the future! The persons who figure in this decree are of more than passing interest. The mover is that Eubulides against whom, the year previous, Euxitheus defended himself in a speech written for him by Demosthenes (LVII). Two of the Abderites seem to be those whose names appear on coins of Abdera issued between 400 and 350; while an amendment is added on the motion of that Diopithes who was characterised by Hyperides as *δεινότατος δοκῶν εἶναι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει*.

The interest in another new fragment (224b) is due to the fact that it supplements an older piece and confirms Foucart's guess, made in 1888, that the mover of the decree was Aristophon of Azenia, that vigorous citizen who at this date was a man of at least eighty years and who since the close of the fifth century had never ceased to be in the public eye. Foucart had only *Αρ*, the spacing and the name of the deme to go by, but he hit the truth. What he could not guess was that the business of the decree had to do with Cephallenia.

Athens now begins to feel Macedonian pressure nearer home. Her alliances with Messenia (225) and Eretria (230) remind us how she was trying to strengthen herself. But the decree (226) that assures security to Pyrrhus's grandfather, exiled king of the Molossians, is an ominous warning of Philip's ever-growing power. Several decrees have to do with the struggle over Byzantium, a group with which may be associated a new fragment (273), in which ambassadors from Byzantium receive commendation from Athens. Then the final outcome is revealed (236). Those tragic lines, 'And I will not overthrow the kingdom of Philip or his descendants or the governments of the several states that were in existence when I swore the oaths accompanying the peace', etc., even if not already familiar from literature, would in themselves tell of Chaeronea and the humbling of Athens.

The proud city's state-records show her in the following months acting as the refuge for all of Philip's enemies and her own friends, from distant Acarnania (237) to nearer Andros (238). But the strange note of subservience to a foreign court soon sounds in the language of the decrees. Hardly a year has elapsed when the state is found voting its thanks to some friend in Macedon for good offices rendered in its behalf (240). Perhaps a second copy of this, certainly a decree passed on the self-same day, is begun for us in a preamble whose restoration has been effected through the accession of a

new fragment (241b). We should like to think this identical with the other, in as much as the mover's name is preserved in this and only conjecturally restored in the other. It is that of the notorious, philippising Demades.

Two other new fragments have made it possible to restore IG II 532². Koehler had not even attempted it; so little was preserved. Wilhelm has combined the three fragments into the new document (251), which, dated by the letters and the language of the formula before 336-335, records the enfranchisement of a man whose name of five letters ended in -ης and had *ε* for its second letter.

Among the Athenian metics at the close of the fourth century was one whose gravestone reads *Φίλων Ἀσκληπιοδώρου ἰσοτέλης* (IG II 2733). A new document records probably the original grant of *ἰσοτέλεια* to the father (276). More valuable is the reason for this honor. Asclepiodorus had distinguished himself, fighting on board the trireme of Chares, perhaps in the Cardian affair of 341 which caused Demosthenes to deliver his oration on the Chersonese. A rider is moved by 'the friend and companion of Chares', Cephisophon, a prominent political figure of the day.

In another new fragment of this period (277), which offers tantalizing possibilities of restoration, Evagoras of Corcyra is commended and to him is voted a gold crown. The important reasons have not as yet been drawn from the bits of words on the stone.

Passing the recently published fragment of Alexander's renewal of his father's compact with the Greeks (329) and the imposing decree of the senate and people in honor of their *ἱεροποιούς* (330), we come to another of the important documents of the time: a law of the *nomothetae*, which was promulgated in the late spring of 334 and provided, on the motion of the illustrious Lycurgus, for much greater magnificence in the public festivals (333). A new piece has been added to this, which, besides being a help in restoring the older parts, contributes Itonian Athena to the list of divinities. It is a surprise to find the Thessalian or Boeotian epithet *Ἰτῶνη*. But that the goddess was worshipped with this epithet in Athens was already indicated by IG I 210, and now we have this new evidence.

Other witnesses to the controlling spirit of Lycurgus at this time follow in rapid succession: arrangements for the annual celebration of the lesser Panathenaic festivals (334); permission to the foreign merchants from Citium to worship Aphrodite in a temple of their own building, as the Egyptians worshipped Isis (337); and public thanks to the Plataean Eudemus for substantial assistance in building the Stadium (351). Another notable document of the Lycurgan period (411) is a lease of public land to one Socles, for a period of twenty-five years, with alternate harvesting by him and by the state. Such documents illustrating the economic conditions in antiquity are most precious. In its latest

²This and the similar references below are to the older edition of the work under discussion (not to Kirchner's revision).

dress the detached phrases of the original publication have been made over into an almost unbroken paragraph of about forty lines so that it appears to us really like a new inscription.

Foreign affairs of this and earlier periods are briefly touched upon in a new honorary decree (356), passed on the 28th of Maimacterion, 327 B.C. The record of Memnon himself, the gentleman honored, is lost; but the services to Athens of his distinguished relatives are alluded to in the portion that is legible. Descended from Pharnabazos and Artabazos, whose assistance in earlier wars is mentioned, his father seems to have been commander of the Greek mercenaries on the Persian side fighting against Alexander at the battle of Issus, and his grandfather Mentor *τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ στρατευομένου*, as this decree runs, *τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔσφωεν* (notice the *ε* in the aorist of *σφίζω*). This event of the year 344 receives extended treatment in Diodorus 16.42 ff.

Another new fragment (416), of uncertain date, may, perhaps, from the contents, which deal with the importation of grain, be set within the years 330 and 326. The food-supply was an old and ever-present problem to the state; and in that period there was an actual dearth. A citizen of Cos is made an Athenian *proxenus* because on the testimony of the people of Samos and the Athenian wholesale importers he had given such invaluable aid to the latter, *ὅπως ἂν σίτος ὡς ἀφθονωτάτως εἰσπλεῖ τῷ δήμῳ*. Hence the thanks of the state.

In June of 323 Alexander died. The Greek uprising that followed, headed by the Athenians and the Aetolians, and known as the Lamian, or better, the Hellenic War, has been illuminated by those magnificent records of the public services of Euphron of Sicyon (448), of Timosthenes (467), and of metics from Ilios (505), Ephesus (505), and Phaselis (554). But they are of less importance in some respects than the new document relating to the same events. We now have the name-heading of the famous alliance with the Aetolians (370), and from the year 302 an honorary decree of great importance (493), which has just received full treatment, at the hands of its discoverer, in *The American Journal of Archaeology*, 17 (1913), 506-519. This tells of a sea-fight off Abydos 'in the former war', *ἐπὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ προτέρου*, correctly identified as the Hellenic War. By the aid of this new historical fact an older document (398) has been restored more completely than heretofore as referring to this same previously unknown sea-fight rather than to the battle of the Granicus. The importance of the discovery of this event lies in the fact that it vindicates Athenian strategy. Athenian strategists have received severe criticism for their apparent blindness to the necessity of controlling the Hellespont. Now it is no longer possible to affirm that, although their eyes do not seem to have been opened until it was really too late. This battle in the Hellespont was plainly a disastrous defeat for the Athenians. Our two documents both set forth the thanks of the state to men of Abydos who saved many Athenian citizens from the wrecks and provided them with the means of reaching home. The new

decree was not voted immediately like the other but seems to have been delayed and then postponed in the ensuing twenty years of hurly-burly politics until the restoration of the democratic régime and a period of peace. The implied 'later war' must be the so-called 'Four Years' War between Demetrius and Cassander for the possession of Greece, 306-302, which immediately preceded the year of this decree. Several valuable facts may be drawn from the new document. In the first place, it contains the aorist of *σφίζω*, again with an iota. I have already called attention above to another new inscription in which this form occurs. Indeed, there is no other form known in inscriptions, although hitherto the evidence was so scanty that the examples of this form seemed like exceptions to the rule. Even so, Blass in his revision of Kühner's *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache* did not hesitate to write, "Bei den Autoren schreibt man *ἔσωσα* ohne Gewähr". His statement now receives splendid confirmation in the existence of five assured instances and the certain restoration of the form within a sixth. In the second place, Diodorus's vague reference to two sea-fights in this Hellenic War can be cleared up and his record proven true. We now know of two: this one at Abydos and the famous one at Amorgus in 322-321.

Further, we must limit Demosthenes's characterization of the people of Abydos as *μισοθηναῖοι*, 'Athenian-Haters of the Deepest Dye', to the earlier Fourth century, or at least withdraw this accusation from some of the citizens in the town.

There is no fresh material for the régime of Demetrius of Phalerum. The most important document of that period is still the eulogy of the Macedonian Asander, brother of Parmenio (450). In his case the language of the formula permitting him to erect his equestrian statue, *ὅπου ἂν βούληται, πλὴν παρ' Ἀρμόδιον καὶ Ἀριστογείτονα*, reads with peculiar irony. A Macedonian's place was hardly by their side.

When in June of 307 Demetrius Poliorcetes drove the Phalerian out of Athens, about two months elapsed before the new system of government, based on twelve tribes, instead of ten, went into effect. Into that interval apparently falls a decree (466) which in its older fragment (a) mentions Munychia, Antigonos, and Demetrius Poliorcetes and in a new fragment (b) designates the senate by a sign = *πεντήκοντα*. The former data imply the expulsion of Demetrius of Phalerum; the latter phrase is incompatible with the institutions of Poliorcetes. The document is a ratification of a commercial treaty with Tenos, the full meaning of which has not yet been apprehended.

In these years of democratic restoration the work of the old statesman Demochares can be seen in the remarkable specifications for the rebuilding of the walls of Athens and the Piraeus (463). But perhaps the most conspicuous feature at this time is the ubiquity of Stratocles, the extreme radical of Diomeia. In all he appears as mover of eighteen decrees. It is Stratocles who moves that the Colophonians's present of a

crown and panoply to Athens be proclaimed at the Panathenaic games in the Stadium (456); who presents a memorial of the public services of Lycurgus, which is preserved to us also, in condensed form, in the Lives of the Ten Orators (457); who secures the commendation of an antagonist of Cassander (469), and the same for friends of Antigonos and Demetrius (471, 492, 495, 496) and for a hero of the Four Years' War who had given aid to the Athenian hipparchs (503). Thus, as decree after decree is read, we find in each the significant phrase *Στρατοκλῆς Εὐθυδήμου Διομενὸς εἶπεν*. Among the new decrees there are two which were passed on the motion of Stratocles: one (486) enfranchising a friend of Antigonos and Demetrius at the request of the latter; another (499) honoring a nameless benefactor for contributing 5000 medimni of barley to the city. And it would surprise no one if the preamble of a third new honorary decree (507) which bestows Athenian citizenship on Solon of Bargylia, another courtier of Demetrius, should some day turn up and name Stratocles as the mover.

Other new material from the end of the fourth century has less value than that already mentioned; a new example of the state's commendation of its own magistrates, in this case, senators (514); a decree to be erected 'near the stele on which is recorded the vote of the people in honor of their ancestors' (525); one (563) like 469 and 491, apparently, connected with the Euboean military operations of Demetrius in the year 307-306; two additional documents concerned with the people of Priene (567 and 693); an addition to the important fragment (584) which has to do with the runaway slave problem; and a tiny fragment of a precinct-lease (598).

In the late summer of 301 the Radicals were obliged to yield to the Moderates and the pro-Macedonian party. The decrees at once reflect the change. The first decree in this period (641), August 299, is moved by the wealthy Moderate, Philippides of Paeania. It took less than six years for old enmities to be laid to rest and Philippides is then himself the recipient of honors (649) on the motion of the irrepressible Stratocles.

Of King Lysimachus we hear little in the Athenian state-documents. One dilapidated fragment of uncertain date honors his ambassador and tells of negotiations carried on with him (662). The name of this ambassador as well as practically all of the last seven lines can now be supplied from a second copy (663), recently discovered on the Acropolis, which begins at the seventh line and adds the rest of the decree. From the new piece no new historical facts can be gathered, but a topographical notice which it contains may prove to be of considerable value. For, according to the inscription, the decree is to be set up in the precinct of Aglaurus. As this stone was found north-east of the Propylaea and the other copy was also found on the Acropolis, perhaps a new survey of the evidence could localize this interesting spot on the top, and not lower in a cave, of the hill. It is a point worth investigation, as from naming that desolate corner of the hill much

might come besides a vindication of the discredited scholiast on Demosthenes 19. 303, who located the precinct near 'the Propylaea of the City'.

But these negotiations were all brought to nought by Lysimachus's death. Athens was in fact better off so. Lemnos was given back to her (672) and she had some years of peace, which are marked by her commendation of Strombichus (666, 667), for his faithful services at the head of the mercenary troops; of her eponymous archon in the year 282, whose official duties make interesting reading; and, in the latter part of 277, of the prytans of the tribe Antiochis (674).

Now comes the sudden leap to power of the adventurous son of Demetrius Poliorcetes. In the collapse of all opposition to his reassertion of supremacy over Greece, Athens saw her wisest course was peaceable submission. It is the friends of Antigonos Gonatas that the state is now interested in. Her honors fall to such men as Heraclitus of the deme Athmonea (677), who had dedicated to Athena Nike some paintings containing *ὑπομνήματα τῶν [τῷ βασιλεῖ] πεπραγμένων πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτηρίας*, or to Phaedrus of Sphectus, whose biography is contained in an inscription one hundred lines in length (682). All too soon, however, Athens joined with Sparta, supported by Egypt, in revolt against the new master. We already possessed the decree moved by Chremonides that committed Athens to this useless as well as foolish step (687). We now have some new material (686) which considerably enlarges our information about these initial steps. This is regarded by Kirchner as part of the preliminary negotiations that preceded the formal decree of alliance. It may be, however, that the new piece is actually a part of the older treaty.

Quite a large number of new fragments have been added to the historical material of the early third century, which have not been more accurately dated. The people of Elaea, once tributaries in the Delian Confederacy, send ambassadors and receive commendation (695); a group of prytans are honored on the motion of a Demetrius of Phalerum, perhaps the grandson of his more illustrious namesake, who at this time was a prominent partisan of Macedon (702); the Bithynian town Myrleia seems to be in sympathy with Athens about 270 B.C., a bond which historians took for granted but for which they had no evidence (703); the citizenship conferred on Evagoras of Cyprus and his descendants towards the close of the fifth century is reaffirmed to one of those descendants, 'that the state may be seen to guard safely all honors conferred on its benefactors and their children' (716).

The remaining documents in this volume carry us through the reigns of Antigonos and Demetrius II, 'a generation of Macedonian rule'. Aristomachus, tyrant of Argos, receives the state's thanks in 250-249 for his effective intercession with Antigonos five years earlier (774). There are two decrees bearing on the interesting case of international arbitration between citizens of Boeotia and citizens of Athens when the

judges came from Lamia (778, 779). A valuable new fragment (793) records the erection of a statue of Antigonos Gonatas about which nothing had been known before. It is concrete testimony to the renewed loyalty of Athens between the years 255 and 230. Another new document of the middle of the third century (823) records some benefactor's interest in *σώματα*. Have we to do with a physician or with runaway slaves?

Finally may be mentioned a document (791) which is not new but of unfailing interest to us because of the older spirit of cooperation which it portrays. In the early summer of 232

The crops in the Thriasian and Athenian plains had been damaged, and the rest were in peril. A call was, therefore, made upon the citizens to contribute funds for their protection and harvesting. The need was, obviously, immediate, for the subscription list was to be closed within the month Munychion, and it was to be met by a popular movement; hence a maximum of two hundred and a minimum of fifty *drachmae* was imposed. The call was enthusiastically responded to, and Eurykleides of Cephisia, the military treasurer of the year, was able to give credit in his published accounts for subscriptions amounting to not less and probably much more than twenty thousand *drachmae*³.

The record thus begins in 403 B.C. with a free Athenian democracy and ends a century and a half later with a subject Macedonian state. The documents rarely carry us unto the literary, philosophical, or artistic life of the period, but it is upon them that we depend for the calendar and the chronology, for specific examples of known general policies and for innumerable details of ancient public life. Above all, the generations of influential statesmen appear to us in their various civic capacities; it may be as presiding officers and archons, or as efficient members of senate and assembly. They belong to the world of action and in their day were doubtless accounted of greater value to the state than those whose names never appear in these pages. Plato, Aristophanes, Praxiteles or Menander are not the names we meet. For them we look to other documents than the decrees of the senate and the people. It is Demosthenes, or Chares, or Philocrates, or Demades, or Phaedrus, or Stratocles. Their activities are here recorded in the formal and conventional language of Athenian decrees; and yet they are not *ignoti longa nocte, carent quia vate sacro*. They too have found a *monumentum aere perennius*, although for many it has proved to be only a marble slab carved by the hand of some humble employee of the Attic state. To us they seem a pathetic line of ambitious spirits striving for unattainable goals and battling against world-forces they could not discern. But that is just the appeal of this ancient human story. We are just as ignorant of the future as they were. And for those who have eyes to see, the state-documents of Hellenistic Athens, both new and old, contain a fascinating picture of public life in a Greek city-state.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

KENDALL K. SMITH.

³Ferguson, Hellenistic Athens, 203-204.

CLASSICAL CONFERENCE, NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 28

As announced last week, on Saturday morning, November 28, at 9 o'clock, at the College of the City of New York, 138th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York City, there will be a Classical Conference in connection with the annual meeting of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. The leading paper will be read by Dr. W. E. Foster, of the Stuyvesant High School, New York City, on The Reorganization of Secondary School Latin. Dr. Foster is Chairman of the Latin Section of the Committee on Reorganization of Secondary Education, appointed by the National Education Association. His paper will deal with the work of the first two years of the Secondary School course. The following are expected to take part in the discussion: Mr. Charles Breed, of the Lawrenceville School, Miss Jessie M. Glenn of the High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Mr. Paul R. Jenks, of the Flushing High School, New York City, Miss T. E. Wye, of Teachers College, Columbia University, and Professor Charles Knapp.

At the close of this discussion, the Chairman of the Conference, Mr. F. A. Dakin, of the Haverford School, hopes to have an exchange of experiences about the teaching of vocabulary, syntax, composition, and unprepared reading.

There will be an exhibition also of charts showing the value of the study of Latin, prepared by Miss Genevieve Cloyd, of Hunter College.

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH AND VICINITY

The first meeting of the Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity for the current year will be held at the University of Pittsburgh, on Friday and Saturday, November 27-28, in connection with the annual meeting of the Association of Secondary Schools of the Upper Ohio Valley. On Friday, at 3.30, there will be a presentation of the Report of the National Committee on the Re-organization of Latin in Secondary Schools, by Miss Mary L. Breene, Peabody High School, Pittsburgh.

On Saturday, at 10, there will be papers on The Advisability of a Uniform Grammatical Nomenclature, by Mr. W. H. Rankin, Knoxville High School; Should Latin be Taught in the Seventh and Eighth Grades? by Mr. Luther B. Adams, Principal of the Shadyside Academy; and A Re-organized Two-Year Course in Latin for the General Student, by Mr. Norman E. Henry, Peabody High School, Pittsburgh.

The second meeting for the year will be held on Saturday, December 19.

UPPER HUDSON CLASSICAL CLUB

The Upper Hudson Classical Club has announced its programme for the current year as follows:

NOVEMBER 7—ALBANY ACADEMY. Annual Meeting and election of officers. Address by Prof. Gonzalez

Lodge, of Teachers College, on The Importance and Difficulty of Beginning Latin. An informal Question-Box will follow.

DECEMBER 5—THE SCHENECTADY HIGH SCHOOL. A Greek Rally.

JANUARY 9—THE SCHENECTADY HIGH SCHOOL. A Seminar in Vergil; to be conducted by Prof. George Dwight Kellogg, of Union College. After the seminar the meeting will be open for general discussion of subjects connected with the teaching of Vergil.

FEBRUARY 6—THE TROY HIGH SCHOOL. Question-Box. All questions should be sent as early as possible to the Secretary, so as to insure well-considered answers.

MARCH 6—THE SCHENECTADY HIGH SCHOOL. Seminar in Cicero's Letters. In the open meeting following, topics connected with the teaching of Cicero will be discussed.

APRIL 10 (or later, at the discretion of the Executive Committee)—SARATOGA; at the Pompeian House. An archeological *giro* with a study of the *Domus Romana*.

Membership in the Club costs fifty cents. Membership in the Club, together with membership in The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, costs \$2.00. This includes the subscription to *The Classical Weekly*, a publication indispensable to the teacher of the Classics.

All communications should be mailed to the Secretary, Miss Carolyn Whipple, Schenectady High School.

The meetings begin at 2:30 P. M. on the Saturdays specified. One of the chief aims of the Club is to encourage sociability among the members.

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The first meeting of the New York Latin Club for 1914-1915 was held on Saturday, November 7, at the Washington Irving High School, New York City. The meeting was large and enthusiastic. After the luncheon, the President of the Club, Dr. W. T. Vlyman, of the Eastern District High School, Brooklyn, forcefully expressed his belief in the value of the Classics as a direct preparation for life, and earnestly urged all present to vigorous efforts to make the Club powerful in numbers, so that it should be in position to influence the sentiment of those who control the curriculum of the Public Schools. He then introduced Mrs. Francis G. Allinson, who spoke on Attic Memorabilia.

Delightful indeed and inspiring were Mrs. Allinson's reminiscences of continuous days spent on the Acropolis or in charming walks through the Attic plain. Vividly she portrayed the many advantages, physical, mental and moral, to be derived from a sojourn in Greece: the intoxicating air that makes a walk of fifteen miles a day a delight, the invigorating out-of-door life, the inspiration of seeing at every turn great and sacred treasures, and the austerity of the landscape of the Attic plain, suggesting the roll of the epic rather than the lyric quality of the Italian landscape. This ascetic quality of the Attic landscape produces a curious feeling of self-respect, and fosters high ideals. Full of interest is the sail to Salamis, or ferrying to Megara, or the trip to Marathon, where a plunge in

the sea fits one for the tramp of over twenty-five miles back to Athens. Mrs. Allinson showed how all these tramps illuminated many things in Greek life and literature: coming upon the birthplace of Demosthenes or a pre-historic Mycenaean tomb makes a walk worth while. Everywhere one finds exquisite bits of old Greek sculpture, as in some plain country school-room, or in a little coffee-house. It was noted, further, that it is from the common people of to-day in Greece that the strongest opposition comes to the popularizing of the Greek language: the peasants are very proud when their children, who have been taught in the public schools of Greece, can converse in literary Greek with foreign professors, something which the parents themselves cannot do.

An amendment to the Constitution of the Club, making the retiring President a member of the Executive Committee, was adopted.

Reports were made concerning the Greek Scholarship Fund which the Club has undertaken to raise. The total in the Fund, on September 30 last, was \$1313.81. Of this amount the sum of \$1000 has been invested in such way as to yield fifty dollars yearly. Beginning in June, 1915, the sum of fifty dollars yearly will be awarded to the pupil, boy or girl, who makes the best record in Greek at the examination set by the Regents of the University of the State of New York. The Club is thus offering annually two prizes, one in Latin, one in Greek. Plans are under consideration to increase the fund, which, it is hoped, will ultimately reach the sum of \$5000.

A suggestion was made that the Club consider carefully whether anything would be gained by changing the name of the Club in such way that the very title of the Club shall suggest clearly the interest of the Club in Greek.

THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

This flourishing Club held its first meeting for the year 1914-1915 on November 6, at the University Club. Thirty-nine members were present, and seven new members were elected. Professor George D. Hadzsits, of the University of Pennsylvania, read a scholarly and interesting paper on Lucretius the Protestant, in which he discussed the attitude of Lucretius toward the Roman religion of his day and toward the Epicurean philosophy.

B. W. MITCHELL, Secretary.

We have received a copy of an interesting pamphlet, entitled Latin and Greek in Education, which consists of articles by representative members of the Faculty of the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, expressing their sentiments concerning the value of Latin and Greek in preparation for higher education.

Any person interested in this pamphlet may secure a copy, without charge, so long as the edition lasts, by writing to the Secretary of the University.